THEOLOGY

VOL. LIII JUNE, 1950 No. 360

Drawing out Leviathan with a Hook[1]

AN ARCHBISHOP'S FEARS FOR THE FUTURE

The gentle Archbishop of York is up,
With well-appointed powers; he is a man
Who with a double surety binds his followers.

THIS characterization aptly describes Dr Garbett's manifesto for mending or ending the establishment,[2] which is designed to unfurl the standard around which to rally his followers. Its first merit indeed lies in the author's well-appointed powers. His long service to the Church of England is writ large in the record of parish, diocese, and province; and one of the most attractive features of his present book lies in the periodic autobiographical asides with which it is diversified. Moreover he is scrupulously fair in his appreciation of the advantages of establishment, even in the sore point of the method of episcopal appointments; so impartial indeed that the impression made upon one careful reader is that the present system has much more to be said for it, and the proposed reforms much less to be urged in their behalf, than he had expected. The archbishop has paid historians the high compliment of choosing the historical method of approach to his subject; and the number and variety of books mentioned by citation or in footnotes are sufficient evidence of the amount of work which has gone to the making of his volume. When to these merits there is added the recollection that he is no longer even middle-aged, that he has the oversight of a large diocese as well as the responsibility of a province, and that his respite from these duties seems generally to take the form of labours more abundant in divers and distant parts of the earth, astonishment becomes admiration that he has somehow found time to compose so long and informative a book. In parts indeed it suffers from these many avocations; for it is diffuse and often repetitive; for example, the natural sequence of his argument from the chapter on disestablishment to that on appointment of bishops is broken by a historical excursus on church reform in the past, which to some extent repeats what has been said before in scattered fashion in the earlier historical survey; and the same criticism could be made of the excursus on the history of canon law and of ecclesiastical courts with which he prefaces his suggested reforms in these spheres. The volume would have benefited from careful pruning. On the other hand, the his-

[1] Parts of this article were used in a broadcast talk, given in the Third Programme on May 5, 1950.

[2] *Church and State in England.* By Cyril Garbett, Archbishop of York. Hodder and Stoughton. 15s.

torical approach has two considerable advantages; on the one hand it delivers the author from the illusion that at some period in its past history, whether in the Anglo-Saxon era or in that immediately following Magna Carta, the Church of England enjoyed freedom as Dr Garbett understands it; and on the other hand it enables and emboldens a student of history, who is lacking in the ecclesiastical experience of the author, to join issue with him both on points of history and of present reform.

Since the historical introduction, which sketches briefly the relations of church and state from the apostolic age to the present century, is intended only as a prelude to the proposals for reform, and occupies only 179 pages compared with 136 pages devoted to the argument for change, it is unnecessary to dwell on points of detail, on which the reader might differ from the author.

Indeed, Dr Garbett is chiefly concerned with the present position of the establishment, and finds the shoe to pinch at four particular places: in the appointment of bishops, in the procedure laid down by the Enabling act (only a generation ago) for the approval by parliament of measures for Prayer Book revision, in the revision of canon law, and in the constitution of the final court of appeal in causes ecclesiastical. It is necessary therefore to consider his proposals in these matters seriatim.

In his sketch of the present method of episcopal appointments, the archbishop emphasizes the thoroughness of consultation, whether in writing or orally or both, between the archbishop of the province and the prime minister, and the great care taken to ensure the nomination of fit persons. His objection is one of principle: "In principle it is wrong that the chief officers of a spiritual society should be chosen by a layman who need neither belong to it nor be sympathetic towards it" (p. 198). Dr Garbett contrasts here the prime minister with the sovereign who "must be a member of the Church of England" (p. 123)—and in passing it may be observed that by the act of settlement the sovereign is required only to "join in communion with the Church of England", which was done by the Calvinist William of Orange and the Lutheran George of Hanover without ceasing membership of their former churches—and proposes four reforms to meet the anomaly. Of the first, the abolition of the penalties of *præmunire* in respect of cathedral chapters refusing to elect the royal nominee, it may be said that, like the fall of the Bastille, it would be a quixotic gesture rather than a serious contribution to reform. For in fact the penalty has never been inflicted. His second proposal is that "before the congé d'élire is received, the chapter should petition for the right to elect, . . . and at the same time it should send to the prime minister three names". The former step has been part of the traditional procedure in episcopal appointments in the Church of England since the thirteenth century! For Laurence de Somercotes in 1254 in his *Tractatus sive Summa de Electionibus Episcoporum* wrote that it was then *de consuetudine ecclesiæ Anglicanæ* for the dean and chapter to send some of their body *ad dominum regem, petituri ab eo eligendi licenciam.*

Furthermore, the congé d'élire itself begins by reciting: Ex parte vestra nobis est humiliter supplicatum, ut cum Ecclesia prædicta . . . jam vacet ac pastoris sit solatio destituta, alium vobis eligendum in Episcopum ac Pastorem licentiam nostram vobis concedere dignaremur.

It is strange that Dr Garbett, who has been successively bishop of three sees, does not know that this suggestion on his part is not new but traditional. His further proposal that the chapter should submit three names is useful, though this might be done with greater propriety by sending them to the archbishop. There is no suggestion that the choice of the crown should be restricted to the persons named by the chapter. Finally, the archbishop of York wishes to give to the primates of the two provinces the right at the confirmation of bishops-elect to hear objections against their orthodoxy, and to be freed from penalties for refusal to confirm. But there exists already a sufficient safeguard against improper appointments in the archbishop's right to refuse to consecrate; and it would surely be more seemly that any serious objection on the grounds of heresy or unfitness for the episcopal office against any clergyman should be resolved or upheld in confidential exchanges between primate and prime minister, with the archiepiscopal right of refusal to consecrate always held in the background as a weapon and safeguard against improper nominations, than ventilated at the comparatively late stage of the ceremony of confirmation of a person who is already bishop-elect.

But it is evident that Dr Garbett's real proposal for reform lies in his third point; that the chapter should have the right to reject a series of names suggested by the prime minister. This is surely to make the worst of all possible worlds; for it assumes in the chapter a superior wisdom and a deeper insight into the needs of the church than that possessed by archbishop and prime minister in combination. Moreover, it may be inquired whom the greater chapter represents? It is not elected even by the diocesan clergy; but consists of nominees of the bishop (save for the dean and such residentiary canons as may have been appointed by the crown); so that it represents the personal preferences of former bishops! Particularly, we may justly ask Dr Garbett what has happened to his favourite principle of consultation and consent of the laity? Where do they come into the picture? The answer must be: Nowhere; for the prime minister, who is the only non-clerical element in Dr Garbett's scheme (save for the crown), has been deprived by the archbishop's own premises of the status of layman as being not necessarily even a Christian. Furthermore, there is a practical objection in the difficulty of ensuring absolute secrecy in transactions which involve the transmission of a series of names to and from a chapter consisting perhaps of thirty or forty persons; and the number of clergymen saying *nolumus episcopari* might well be increased owing to reluctance to allow their names to be thus bandied about. Again, what has happened to the wider interests of the church as a whole if the preponderant interest in episcopal nominations is given to the

chapter, against the opinion of primate and prime minister? It should be remembered that a Victorian high-church archbishop, Benson, recorded his fear of the danger of diocesanism in strong words: "diocesanism is a new force of dissent as virulent as congregationalism—and more." Dr Garbett of course can reply that he twice emphasizes that his proposals leave the prime minister full freedom to insist on his own nomination and to override the refusal of the chapter to elect, by the issue of royal Letters Patent as at present provided. "Nothing in these proposals would take away either the right of the prime minister to nominate or the right of the crown to appoint" (p. 203). We reach therefore a quite Gilbertian conclusion! For Dr Garbett starts from the position that it is wrong "in principle" for a prime minister who need not be even a Christian to choose bishops; and ends by leaving both the principle and the power intact! Moreover his proposals for the participation of "the church" in episcopal appointments are seen on scrutiny to exclude the laity altogether; and to vest the power of rejecting a nomination, proposed with full consent of primate and prime minister, in a body unrepresentative even of the diocesan clergy. Surely this is not only hopelessly illogical from the archbishop of York's own principles, but in practice would make the worst of all possible worlds.

In regard to the relations of Church Assembly and Parliament, Dr Garbett admits that the rejection of the revised Prayer Books in 1927-8 caused the iron to enter into his soul; and this episode governs his entire attitude to the problem. The present relationship is the result of the Enabling act of 1919, which was itself the outcome of the Life and Liberty Movement, of which he was an ardent supporter; and neither house of parliament has violated the conditions of that act. Dr Garbett "hoped that parliament would follow the precedent of 1662, and accept the book without detailed discussion" (p. 217); and his present demand is that any future measure concerning the worship of the church must be enacted "without being debated in parliament" (p. 222). His intimate knowledge of the 1927-8 episode compels him to admit the reasons for the action of the house of commons; namely, the division of opinion within the church, and the readiness of both Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic elements to appeal to parliament over the head of the church assembly. Nevertheless, instead of placing the blame for this on the church authorities, he visits his displeasure on parliament. In effect, what the house of commons did was to refer the Prayer Book Measures for further consideration in view of the acute division of opinion amongst churchmen on the crucial issues of Reservation and the new Communion Office; and this divergence has not yet been reconciled. Indeed after the 1927 rejection, archbishop Davidson "was ready to make considerable changes about the regulations which should govern Reservation"; and even archbishop Lang "was in favour of abandoning the new Prayer of Consecration". The crux of the present position is whether the interest of the Church of England as a whole is of greater importance than the *amour propre*

of the episcopate in regard to the revised Prayer Book. For that book was truly and essentially a Bishops' Book; since its compilation was the work of the episcopate (whose personnel was admittedly not selected primarily with a view to expert liturgical and historical scholarship); and the houses of clergy and laity were required to give their final vote for or against it, without possibility of amendment. On the other hand, the anomaly of a house of commons so variously constituted debating a measure of Prayer Book revision is evident; and the possibilities of misuse of its power cannot be denied. If and when that house rejects such a measure which has the overwhelming support of churchmen, both Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic, it will be time to consider the fundamental issues involved in such a challenge. But it cannot be fairly said that this was the case in 1927-8. Moreover, Dr Garbett seems to involve himself in sundry inconsistencies in the course of his argument. He makes much of the supposition that the abbreviation of "Dearly Beloved" stands on the same level of illegality as the substitution of another Prayer of Consecration for that in the Prayer Book; without so much as mentioning the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act of 1872, which, both by its actual provisions and by the precedent there set for further extensions of its provisions, makes allowance for minor deviations and variations of use. The present position also is entirely due to the refusal of the bishops to represent to parliament the 1927 revision minus the new Communion Office, and the rules for Reservation; so that they are themselves the authors of their own difficulties in this respect. Again, Dr Garbett appears to agree with Dr Bell that the association of Prayer Book revision with enforcement of discipline was itself a mistake; yet he iterates his complaint that the house of commons' rejection made impossible the restoration of order and discipline in the church. At the same time he affirms that since 1928 "there has arisen the demand for further revision", for "popular services", and for "services simpler even than those provided in the 1928 Book" for baptism and burial of the dead (p. 220). So that in effect the house of commons' action had the unintended but real benefit of releasing the church from the straitwaistcoat of a revised Prayer Book which within twenty years would have needed further drastic revision!

Dr Garbett's proposals for solving this difficulty are substantially those proposed by the Church and State Commission in 1935; namely that all future measures dealing with worship and doctrine shall be approved by the church assembly, by the convocations, and twice approved by not less than three-quarters of the dioceses, and shall then, upon certificate that they relate substantially to the spiritual concerns of the church and involve no change in fundamental doctrine, receive the royal assent without submission to parliament. He admits that such further revision of the Prayer Book should proceed by easy stages; first the non-controversial parts of the 1928 Book; whilst "other more controversial matters, such as the Order of Communion, would require delay until agreement is reached"; and this procedure he defends as "the more statesmanlike policy of

first reaching agreement on matters over which there is little difference, and then going on to those which are more difficult" (p. 222). But when precisely this procedure was suggested in 1928, Dr Garbett writes that "it would have been sheer silliness to have sent to parliament a measure containing all the uncontroversial matter, but omitting the very matters which had necessitated revision" (p. 219). What therefore was "sheer silliness" in 1928 has become in 1950 "the more statesmanlike policy"; but of course the crux of the matter for Dr Garbett is the parliamentary veto, freely agreed to by the church in 1919 and exercised very sparingly indeed by parliament during the intervening generation. To the present reviewer the 1927-8 Prayer Book revision projects become increasingly inadequate as a *casus belli* between church and state.

The third problem envisaged by Dr Garbett is the revision of Canon Law, upon which the Convocations are at present engaged. Here it is necessary to observe that since the Reformation the canon law has become part of the ecclesiastical law of the realm; so that the attempt to abstract the Canons of 1604 and revise them apart from the rest of this ecclesiastical law is itself not without considerable difficulties. Moreover these Canons of 1604 are not binding on the laity; nor will future canons be so unless confirmed by act of parliament. Of the present revision the archbishop writes: that "the great majority of them [the new canons] are entirely uncontroversial"; that "of the few which are controversial, some could be postponed without serious injury to the code as a whole"; (p. 242) that suggestions from the side of the state will be received; and that "if parliament should reject all or some of the canons, or even if the royal assent should be withheld on the advice of the ministers of the crown, the draft canons would remain as an impressive record of what the church regards as necessary for its good government, and they would have strong moral and spiritual authority over all its loyal members" (p. 243). Here, therefore, it would seem that Dr Garbett sees no *casus belli*; and his opinion may be accepted, provided that none of the canons is at variance with the law ecclesiastical of the realm. But there is one point of interest here, deserving of mention. The proposed new Canon XIII offers a definition of the difficult and doubtful phrase "ordered by lawful authority"; and it is worthy of especial note that the present direction of discussion of this canon in Convocation is towards a wider interpretation of this phrase, with a view to facilitating precisely that process of regulated experiment in adapting the services of the Prayer Book to contemporary needs, which the archbishop believes to be a necessary and preliminary stage towards the distant and ultimate goal of a thorough Prayer Book revision Measure. It is possible, and it is permissible to hope, that by this means good assurance will have been obtained of the adequacy and acceptability of future liturgical revision before the authority of the crown in parliament is sought for its enactment.

In respect of the construction of a final court of appeal in causes ecclesiastical which will command the general approval of church-

men, Dr Garbett frankly admits that on this issue clerical dissatisfaction with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and its decisions, is not shared by the laity. "Most of the laity are ready to accept them" (p. 259). Moreover, if the Judicial Committee gave a decision in the Gorham case in 1850 on the doctrine of baptism which was not liked by highchurchmen, it should be remembered that in *Ditcher v. Denison* in 1858 and in *Sheppard v. Bennett* in 1872 its verdicts on Eucharistic doctrine were in favour of their school of churchmanship. Similarly, the fate of Dr Samuel Davidson and of Professor Robertson Smith in "free" churches (both of whom were dismissed for adopting the conclusions of the higher criticism in regard to the Old Testament) makes the English churchman grateful for the protection accorded to Anglican students by the same Judicial Committee during the nineteenth century in like circumstances. Dr Garbett advocates a reform of the final court of appeal which would give a majority membership to bishops, together with two lay judges who shall be communicants. In this connexion it may be remembered that the Church Discipline act of 1840 added to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for hearing appeals in ecclesiastical causes all archbishops and bishops who were members of the privy council, of whom one must be present at the hearing of each appeal. It should not be impossible to achieve a compromise between these positions; which would both provide expert theological opinion on the final court of appeal, and also guard against the danger of a narrowing of the traditional comprehensiveness of the Church of England. In any case it would appear that the archbishop does not regard this particular reform as immediately urgent, since he writes that "there is little hope of an immediate solution of this problem" (p. 264), and suggests the diocesan synod as an interim measure. Certainly it would be difficult to conceive of the laity demanding disestablishment in order to get rid of the judicial committee of the privy council!

Behind these particular reforms, however, there lurks Dr Garbett's fear (one might almost say obsession) of the coming of the totalitarian state in this country: "The state is steadily moving in the direction of totalitarianism" (p. 139); "It looks sometimes as if the state might become totalitarian in spirit and in claims" (p. 141); and a formidable list is given (pp. 312-3) of ways in which the state *might* oppress the church. Against this must be set the archbishop's frank admission that in fact it has done none of these things; and the further important considerations that both in the programmes of the B.B.C. and in the provisions of the Butler education act, full recognition of and freedom for religion are accorded. The threat of totalitarian persecution of the church is therefore not actual; and perhaps if Dr Garbett had written after the result of the recent general election he might have been reassured, since the electorate, far from indicating its desire for a single-party house of commons, acted on the principle of almost equal shares for both the chief political parties. But if the menace of the anti-God totalitarian state is the real fear of Dr Garbett, how lamentably inadequate are his

reforms to withstand it! Can it be seriously supposed that if such a state were to wish to pack the bench with subservient political prelates it would suffer itself to be thwarted by the negative votes of our cathedral chapters? Or that if it wished to subject Dr Garbett to the fate of the primate of Hungary, a purely "spiritual" final court of appeal or the enactment of a revised canon law would save him from the rough justice of the people's courts? Truly, in fear and prospect of such a régime, the archbishop vainly thinks to draw out Leviathan with a hook!

Nor can the present reviewer see how the proposed reforms would set forward any of the practical matters on which the archbishop justly lays much stress; for example, how they would increase the number of clergy, or pay their stipends, or solve the problems of pluralism and non-residence, or build new and smaller parsonage houses. To the solution of these questions they would contribute nothing. Still more remarkable is the author's abstention from indicating any practical steps towards reform of the Convocations and the Church Assembly, where the work should begin. For example, in respect of Prayer Book revision he writes that "the dilatoriness of the Convocations became a scandal" (p. 212); and in the matter of canon law revision he delineates the several steps of the "long journey" which will have to be made before this task is completed (pp. 242-3). But his book contains not one proposal for reform of Convocational procedure. Indeed, in discussing the problem of the parson's freehold, he comes near to throwing up the sponge when he writes: "The clergy themselves must look for a remedy; . . . in their Convocations they have the responsibility of devising some plan by which their freehold is preserved, but its abuse is avoided" (p. 293).

Even more remarkable is the absence of suggestion for improving the share, and making more effective the representation, of the laity in the self-government of the church; though the archbishop iterates that "no church reform to-day would have any chance of approval by parliament unless it was certain that behind it there was the support of the laity" (p. 116). Not that he is unaware of the imperfections of the present system for the representation of the laity. "In the Church of Scotland, the laity have always had a much more assured position in the government and administration of their church than has been the case in England both before and after the Reformation" (p. 154). Again: "The smallness of the electoral roll is at the moment a serious weakness. It will prejudice the influence of the [Church] Assembly, for when a controversial Measure is sent to Parliament, the question will be asked as to how far the Assembly is really representative. . . . At present the laity either on the diocesan conferences or in the Church Assembly are not sufficiently representative of the working classes. This is a serious drawback. Those dependent upon a weekly wage cannot afford the expense caused by five days in London—this is especially true of those living in the north. The difficulty must be overcome if the Assembly is to be truly representative of the laity" (p. 117).

The reader looks in vain, however, for any practical suggestions of reform to bring the Church of England nearer to the Church of Scotland in this vital matter; and Dr Garbett shrinks also from grasping the nettle of the jealousy entertained by the purely clerical Convocations for the house of laity in the Church Assembly. Actually, the laity would have no share whatever in his new system for the appointment of bishops; their participation in reform of worship is left to the house of laity in the church assembly, of which he has been justly critical owing to its unrepresentative character; and his other suggestions for reform relate to revision of the canon law and the final court of appeal, with both of which he admits that the laity are largely unconcerned and entirely unenthusiastic.

Indeed one of the strongest criticisms of Dr Garbett's reforms may be stated in the words of Dr Neville Figgis: "When the liberty of the Church is claimed, it almost always denoted the liberty of the hierarchy, not that of the whole body." The archbishop, despite his iterated emphasis on the laity, has proposed reforms in the interest of the clerical order mainly. Furthermore, it may be doubted whether his book is timely. During the recent general election Dr Garbett was bold to claim that in prospect of the international problems threatening not only the peace but the very survival of civilization, the differences between the rival British political parties assumed the unimportance of parlour squabbles. May not the same test be applied, and the same conclusion reached, of his own desire to introduce new controversy into the relationship of church and state at this juncture? With one contention indeed all his readers will agree. "If the nation should decide that the connexion between church and state should be brought to an end, then the church should be ready to help the state in carrying through disestablishment without bitterness or injustice" (p. 151). It is impossible to deny that this possibility may be realized from the side of the state; and if so, the archbishop would assuredly "with a double surety bind his followers" in the attitude which he has sketched. Meantime, however, the present reader is unconvinced by his argument either of the urgency of the situation or of the adequacy of his proposed reforms. "Libera Chiesa in Libero Stato . . . Whether or no this ideal can be attained is doubtful," wrote Dr Figgis; "that it never has been attained is certain. But approximations may be made." Dr Garbett indeed assures us that "at present the church has great freedom in practice, but little in theory; we must be careful not to gain unlimited freedom in the abstract, but very little in the concrete" (p. 145). It may be hoped that the Church of England will not sacrifice its admitted freedom in practice for the hypothetical and very limited freedom in the abstract which is all that could be expected from the archbishop of York's present project for reform.

NORMAN SYKES.

The Appeal to the Bible[1]

It would be fitting if I were to offer to a society of scholars a paper on some piece of research or other exercise in pure scholarship. I hope, however, that I may have your indulgence if I take a different line and deal with a subject which I find peculiarly relevant to an occasion when a theological college teacher has the honour of addressing a group of university teachers of theology. The subject I venture to take springs out of the relation between our two spheres of work in the common field of theology: and in particular that relation in the department of Biblical studies. I suppose we shall all agree that the two spheres, though they overlap, are not wholly coincident. Let me say at once that in my belief the business of a theological college teacher is to be a scholar and to work, like his university confrère, with the scholar's devotion to exact knowledge and critical integrity. But that is not his principal function. What he is paid to do is to train men who are to be preachers of a faith, exponents not of truth in general but of a particular saving truth. The university teacher, on the other hand, while he himself is probably a minister of some Christian communion, and while he is aware that most, though not all, of his pupils are going into one or other of the various ministries, has as his principal work that which is but the *prolegomenon* of the theological college teacher—namely, the critical and objective study of the Christian documents, history and *credenda*. If the business of a university is the disinterested pursuit of knowledge, the university teacher of theology is *ex vi termini* a disinterested seeker after theological knowledge.

This division of labour and diversity of emphasis is, I believe, entirely right and profitable for all concerned. But it does raise a question which, though each one of us here has doubtless his own personal and private answer, is both intrinsically difficult and also, as I think, in need of a fuller exchange of views and of more attentive and diligent study than it commonly receives.

When, in rare moments of leisure, I lean back and reflect at large upon the ordinand's predicament, I am reminded of a line which might be thought to emerge from one of our austere modern poets, but in fact appears in Shakespeare's *Richard III*:

> "See where his grace stands, twixt two clergymen."

The ordinand is very much in the wicked duke's equivocal situation. On the one side is his clerical preceptor at the university, guiding his Biblical studies along the strait path of detached critical and historical scholarship. On the other side is his vicar, who very properly demands of his curate Bible-preaching and Bible-teaching, and means by that something more heart-searching and more edifying than erudition of the historico-critical sort.

The problem is as old as it is familiar. In one form or another it has been recognized and grappled with for centuries. Yet there is

[1] A paper read to the Cambridge Theological Society, February 1950.

no finality in the solutions proposed. I suppose Origen was the first, not to tackle it, but to bring all the energies of a great mind to bear upon it. He saw that the interpretation of Scripture demands certain discriminations and the use of more than one expository method. We may think that his way of handling the problem was not satisfactory; but he saw a real problem. And after centuries of discussion the theological climate of the last thirty years has revived it in a complex form. Our would-be cleric may be pardoned if he finds his Biblical criticism uneasily yoked with some of the Biblical theology of recent times. Yet somehow he must achieve a synthesis, for the fruitful exercise of his preaching and teaching ministry depends upon it.

Various approaches are thrown open to him by the writers of the theological books that come his way. Two in particular will attract his notice at the present time. First, there are those who seem to tell him that we have moved from the critical to the post-critical era and that the critical work of the last 150 years or so has now reached the point at which we can summarize the results, discover—perhaps to our surprise—that they are quite innocuous, and pass happily to the exposition of the Bible as the Word of God without *arrière-pensée*. In the interval between, say, Dr Brunner's *The Mediator* and Dr Rowley's *The Relevance of the Old Testament* there has appeared a large body of literature on the Bible, much of it written by scholars of distinction, themselves brought up in the critical disciplines and continuing to use them as indispensable instruments. These books speak to a wide audience and, as is only natural, they speak with a confidence that seems to vary in inverse proportion to their size; but on the whole they agree in maintaining that through the fires of criticism the Biblical theology, the unity of the Bible, the message of the Bible have come out unscathed. The writers have done much to relieve the tension which seemed nearly, if not quite, unbearable to some of us who can remember the years just before the first world war. I confess that for myself I have welcomed and still do welcome their point of view and regard it as largely sound and justified. Never since Schweitzer published his *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* has it been possible to regard without a large admixture of scepticism what Professor Powicke unkindly describes as "the speculative game called the Higher Criticism" and the confident claims that used to be made for this or that critical reconstruction of Christianity. But equally I confess to some sense of danger here. There is a danger—and I think it is not merely a hypothetical danger—that the historical and critical difficulties may be too lightly regarded and too easily dismissed; and there is the danger that young men may suppose themselves exempt from facing the problems *for themselves*, because their elders are too reassuring. It does, I think, need to be said with some emphasis to-day that this is a matter which the individual must face for himself. Only by the travail of his own soul does a man come into some apprehension of the Word of God in the Bible. You cannot do this work for the ordinand and hand out the result on a plate.

Nor is the ordinand safe from serious danger if he betakes himself wholeheartedly to another contemporary school of thought and embraces the kind of typology now growing in favour in England and (even more) on the Continent. I am very far myself from thinking that we can wholly reject the use of types in Biblical exegesis. Not only Christian devotion but also Christian theology and the Christian understanding of history demand some correspondences, recurring patterns or figures or images, some anticipations and fulfilments. Without these there is no *sacred* history at all, only the débris of history, aggregations of events or alleged events with no significant movement or intelligibility. To recognize this fact, I suppose, is to admit in principle that a spiritual interpretation of Scripture *kata to pneuma*, as well as a literal interpretation *kata to gramma*, is inevitably involved in the claim that Christianity is a revelation—*the* revelation—of creative and redemptive purpose and that this revelation is made through history. Here at least the typologists, for all their whimsies, seem to have touched a fundamental Christian affirmation. But the restraint called for, once this potent wine is uncorked, is very great. It is only too easy, if you drink too deep, to reduce the Scripture to the level of a vast cryptogram and to riot away over uncharted seas of speculative fantasy. I cannot feel quite sure that some writers on Biblical theology have always been careful to stop at the third glass.

I believe we ought to be wary; but I believe also that these two movements of contemporary thought have too much truth in them to be rejected out of hand as "obscurantist"—or whatever vituperative epithet appeals to us. Anyhow, they are here, alive and even kicking, and we have to take them into account. Certain older devices for resolving the tension we are considering need not detain us, because they belong to the so-called pre-critical days of Biblical study and their presuppositions, being different from ours, would involve us in long preliminary entanglements. I need not in this paper spend time on Durandus of Mende and the famous "four senses" of Scripture or on the much less intellectually respectable Fundamentalism still to be found in some Protestant circles. Nor, I imagine, do many of us to-day cut the knot by defending the "Modernist" dichotomy between history and faith or by following the "liberal" anthologists with their neo-Marcionite reduction of the Scripture to a pastiche of agreeable excerpts. In any case I think the two movements I have referred to, the Biblical theology movement and its somewhat ill-favoured offspring, the New Typology movement, are more likely to yield something of value; and I am the more concerned to see what I can learn from these contemporary trends in Biblical study because, willy-nilly, they will certainly attract the attention of the young men I have to deal with.

I would draw attention at this point to a recent publication by a distinguished Cambridge historian, Professor Butterfield's *Christianity and History*, which contains much that is relevant to our problem.

In this work both the underlying unity of the Bible and its perme-

ation by certain symbolic patterns are recognized; and the two are closely linked. Professor Butterfield sees in the historical Jesus one who gathered up the whole story of the Old Testament and fulfilled the things to which the Old Testament had so often pointed (p. 3). He analyses the notion of "technical" or "academic" history, showing that it is both indispensable and at the same time only "a specialized part of our attitude to the past" (p. 25). Contrasted with the historian's restriction to the mechanism of historical processes is the work of religion, which generates power and fills the story with significance, doing something which we cannot, as technical historians, extract by inescapable inferences from the purely historical evidence. The Biblical writers fill history with values, judgments, and affirmations about life and they give it prophetic interpretation. They do this partly by recognizing the presence of divine providence and judgment in history, partly by discovering symbolic patterns, myths which typify essential processes in history and are symbols of historical processes or formulas for something fundamental and significant in history. Outstanding examples are the idea of the Remnant or the type of the Suffering Servant. The Old Testament interpretation of secular history is seen as a necessary substratum to Christianity or it provides the ground-plan for the edifice. "It is difficult", savs the author, "to see how anybody could understand an 'historical religion'—or accept a Christian view of history—without this initial substratum" (pp. 87-8).

To this we may add a similar statement by Professor Arnold Toynbee, in *Civilization on Trial*, p. 14:

> In the vision seen by the Prophets of Israel, Judah and Iran, history is not a cyclic and not a mechanical process. It is the masterful and progressive execution, on the narrow stage of this world, of a divine plan which is revealed to us in this fragmentary glimpse, but which transcends our human powers of vision and understanding in every dimension. Moreover, the Prophets, through their own experience, anticipated Æschylus' discovery that learning comes through suffering.

And again, *ibid.*, p. 235:

> I do not know whether Moses and Abraham are historical characters, but I think it can be taken as certain that they represent historical stages of religious experience, and Moses' forefather and forerunner Abraham received his enlightenment and his promise at the dissolution, in the nineteenth or eighteenth century before Christ, of the ancient civilization of Sumer and Akkad. . . . These men of sorrows were precursors of Christ; and the sufferings through which they won their enlightenment were Stations of the Cross in anticipation of the Crucifixion. That is, no doubt, a very old idea, but it is also an ever new one.

It is, I think, of some importance that the professional historian should formulate these conclusions. For the most part Professor Butterfield speaks in somewhat elusive generalizations, and if I were now concerned with a critical estimate of his book I should have to admit that he often leaves me like Æneas before Dido, "multa parantem dicere", and uncertain of his precise meaning. In any case neither he nor I would wish to be committed to all that has been alleged by the Biblical theologians or the typologists; and I should be very sorry to read into his carefully worded dicta any *Privat-*

meinungen of my own. What he seems to me to do for us, if I understand him rightly, is to bring to light, in an effective way and from beyond the confines of our own specialism as professional students of the Bible, certain general principles of Biblical interpretation. If, greatly daring, I venture to give my own formulation of these principles, I do so very tentatively and with a real desire for correction if I go wrong in this difficult and intricate matter.

1. I would say, then, in the first place, that the unity of the Bible is real and may properly be said to depend, at least in part, upon its attitude to the events it records. These events are prophetically interpreted as divinely controlled for the unfolding of a divine purpose in history, worked out in the drama of Israel. The word "events" here is not a univocal term. The record of events includes purely factual statements, as, for example, that Nebuchadnezzar's troops captured Jerusalem or that Jesus Christ was crucified under Pontius Pilate; it also covers the legendary sagas and *Novellen* of the patriarchs and heroes of Israel and the mythical dramatizations of the creation of the material universe and the origin of man.

2. Since history is the subject-matter, it follows that the Bible requires the critical attentions of the technical historian, if it is to be properly understood. Dr Austin Farrer has stated this need and in downright terms: "prophetism must be got rid of before scientific history can begin, for the dynamic of historical process is not rightly estimated by intuitions of a moralistic divine teleology in battles and famines" (*The Glass of Vision*, p. 101). But the Bible never falls entirely within the technical historian's grasp. He cannot even determine with precision the exact amount of the purely factual element in the drama. But, more important, he is not, *qua* historian, able to confirm or to deny that religious interpretation of the story which for the Biblical writers is far more important than the brute facts and their merely secular concatenation. Indeed those brute facts might conceivably have been widely different in many details without affecting the ultimate and determining convictions of the writers.

3. Within this overarching unity there are to be discovered certain components in its structure. There are certain themes or motifs, like the theme of the Remnant or of the Suffering Servant, or the themes of Providence, Judgment, and Redemption, or the themes of the Father-King and Israel's Sonship, which pervade the whole of the Scripture and fill it with correspondences, analogies, anticipations, and fulfilments. I am not disposed to quarrel with a modern French writer, Père Daniélou, when he says, "le sens spirituel n'est que la recherche de ces correspondances". I have already said that this is a risky line to take, a heady draught which may easily go to men's heads and lead to all sorts of extravagant allegorisms. But that is no fundamental objection to it. In itself it seems to be no more than the recognition of an undeniable corollary of any Christian understanding of history. And we may add of human psychology, as well; for, whatever we may think of Dr Jung's theory of unconscious archetypes, I cannot resist all the evidence for the sway

over the human mind universally exercised by image-thinking, in the religious field as everywhere else. This goes deeper and is more general than the conceptual thinking of the philosopher. I am not therefore in the least unready to find that it enters largely into the scriptural revelation and is utilized by divine providence. Nor is it anything but likely that we shall find that the patterns built out of the recurring images are ultimately focused in Christ, who purifies and transforms them as he gives them actualization and historical fulfilment.

It is at the same time quite obvious that ambiguity lurks in this general notion of the "spiritual sense", which is a blanket-term covering a wide assortment of analogues and parallels. Herein lies the peril of the idea, but herein lies also the need for critical study and discrimination. What the Biblical scholar of to-day and to-morrow has to do—and it is a large and delicate enterprise—is to discover the criteria whereby we may sift the truly relevant and really significant archetypes and analogies from the limitless mass of merely accidental and non-significant correspondences which an ingenious mind can find on every hand in the pages of Scripture. I do not here attempt—it is obviously impossible in a short paper like this—to embark upon that task or even to suggest what kinds of discrimination are necessary. One illustration of the problems involved will suffice. It is clear enough that the images of the *basileia theou* and the *pais theou* really do link the Old Testament and the New. But when St Paul allegorizes Hagar and the passage of Israel through the sea and the cloud, the correspondences alleged, whatever validity they may have, are a very different kettle of fish; they are not on the same level of validity as the great structural themes of Biblical thinking. The contrast indicates the need of much careful work in constructing a scale whereby we can discriminate between the kinds and degrees of symbolism, latent or patent, to be found in the Scriptures. The fact that we are not likely to reach any finality in this critical task does not relieve us of the duty, as it seems to me, of undertaking it. Otherwise we avoid the Scylla of a merely fanciful allegorism only to plunge into the Charybdis of a Biblical atomism which makes the Scripture little more than the playground of the antiquary and the connoisseur of ancient books.

4. If these general notions are valid, it seems to follow that we already possess and have long possessed the place where the richest and fullest understanding of the Bible is to be found: that is in the Liturgy. Here, in the rhythm of the liturgical year, the historical facts of the life and teaching, the death and resurrection of Christ are represented in the context of the spiritual sense of Scripture. Psalms and other lections are used in the traditional liturgies not for their archæological or historical interest, but for their religious value and theological symbolism. For example, in the ancient Western rite for Good Friday, Matins includes—as does the Anglican office of Morning Prayer—psalms 22, 40, and 54. These psalms are referred to the Passion. With what justification? Certainly not their original meaning, as it was consciously held in the mind of the

unknown author; for nobody knows who the original author was or what he had in mind, despite all the researches of a Briggs or a Mowinckel. Nor, I think, can we be content to say that the link is merely one of accidental verbal or literary correspondence. For in psalm 22 the Suffering Servant image or theme appears; not in the profound and searching expressiveness of Isaiah 53, but with a dignity of its own, nevertheless. Here is anticipation of what the Christian sees fulfilled in Christ. The Liturgy is content to leave it there. It does not fetter our minds with any intellectual definition of the precise manner in which the correspondence is to be interpreted or explained. The theologian may speculate and devise a theory of inspiration which will account for it. But the wayfaring Christian need not wait his pleasure.

In one of his minor works, *De Usu Psalmorum*, Alcuin says that we shall find in the psalms the books of the Bible—"omnes divinos libros"—"spiritualiter atque intelligibiliter ex parte tractatos atque descriptos"; and he assures us that we shall find our Lord there, "si intima mente perscruteris et ad medullam intimi intellectus per Dei gratiam perveneris". Doubtless, if we had the opportunity of questioning Alcuin on precisely what he meant by that, we should find some at least of his reply either irrelevant or mistaken or both. But that his words are capable of expressing a profound and permanent truth about the Scripture in its liturgical use is to my mind clear and certain.

All through this, I fear only too tedious, disquisition I have had my ordinand well in mind. I have tried, in a very summary and sketchy fashion, to indicate the sort of suggestions I might make to him to help him in shaping for himself a working synthesis between his critical studies, his prayers, and his preaching. Suggestions, I say, because I have no thought of giving him a pat formula, a reach-me-down answer to a problem that touches a man's personal integrity, indeed his duty to God, at a very profound level. But there is one other line of thought I should want to pass on to him.

We appeal to Scripture. So say all the Christian confessions, my own with unmistakable emphasis. But what do we mean by that? Certainly not all that was in the minds of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Anglican Reformers, to some of whom I fear the humble and harmless editor of the Clarendon Bible St Luke would have seemed as dangerous as any Anabaptist that ever came out of Munster. What then? I venture to think that much contemporary work on the Bible, with its zealous championing of a pure and uncontaminated Biblicism, fails in historical realism. It seems that historical scholarship has not yet succeeded in bringing home to the religious mind of our day the fact that for generations the Christian Church did not possess what we call the Bible. Christian writings appeared very early; probably in the first generation there was a larger literature than the surviving letters of St Paul. But, like the written oracles of the Cumæan Sibyl, they remained scattered. What the Church as a whole did possess and value supremely was the apostolic tradition and with that the Jewish scriptures. No doubt

that apostolic tradition came to be conserved in the canonical books of the New Testament, which thereafter is identified with it, so that in appealing to the one we are *ipso facto* appealing to the other. But the identification is not absolutely complete.

It is a Cambridge scholar whom we all revere who has taught us to think of the apostolic tradition under the two categories of *kerygma* and *didache*. I hope I shall not be guilty of presumption if I suggest that the categories should for completeness be three: *kerygma*, *didache*, and *latreia*. The apostolic tradition surely included a tradition of practice, of worship as well as proclamation and teaching. It was in that worship that the Christian *ecclesia* understood the *kerygma* and renewed its loyalty to the *didache*. The worship had a certain decisive quality, a certain centrality and authority, which for a long period is as normative as the books that were eventually to become the canonical Christian Scriptures of the New Covenant. Indications can be found within the pages of the New Testament itself. It has been plausibly argued that liturgical texts, ranging from the baptismal formula to hymns and credal symbols, can be found there; that one at least of the canonical gospels shows some adaptation of the material to liturgical use; that 1 Peter is, or is based on, a homily for use at a solemn baptism and confirmation of catechumens. It is highly probable that the Liturgy had much to do with such a vital matter as the shaping of the ministry and especially with the emergence of the second-century bishop. More important still is the fact that the process of selecting and canonizing the New Testament Scriptures went on against the background of an already established worship, held to be apostolic in authority. Apostolicity was the primary criterion applied to writings put forward for canonical rank; and it is inconceivable that this apostolicity should have excluded any reference to the tradition of worship already revered and used as apostolic. I should hold that St Ignatius was much more concerned with the tradition of faith and worship than he was with a formal theory of the ministry, and that it was because the clergy—bishops, presbyters, and deacons together—were the custodians of tradition, in faith and worship, that he so insisted upon loyalty to them.

If, then, the faith and worship of the Church precede the formation of the New Testament canon and the final construction of what we know as the Bible, our ordinand, if he is to be historically minded, must give more than a formal recognition to what that implies. Some of the important corollaries seem to be these.

1. We are warned against an exaggerated Biblicism which, by taking the Scriptures in a vacuum, has led—as indeed it must lead—to many kinds of trouble: it may be to Fundamentalism or to scepticism or to some kind of subjective empiricism, such as has made many seek to impose Luther's personal reaction to the epistles to the Galatians and the Romans as the test of the only genuine 100 per cent Christianity.

2. We are given elbow room for an unperturbed critical study of the Biblical documents. These documents record the faith of the

apostolic Church in God's saving work through Christ; from generation to generation they rekindle and feed that faith; they act as a permanent brake on all that ineradicable tendency in fallible and sinful men to betray their trust and to mishandle a heritage which is greater than they can comprehend. But they do not originate that faith.

3. The theology of our ordinand will not be a chase after proof texts, at the mercy of every prevailing wind of theological fashion. Rather it will be his own personal appropriation of the apostolic witness to Christ, the Word made flesh; an apprehension nurtured by the continuous liturgical life of the continuing Mystical Body, no less than by the theological wisdom of Fathers and Doctors.

4. And, lastly, the ordinand finds that the appeal to the Bible is given back to him in an intelligent and really practical form. The appeal is not to an oracular volume fallen from heaven nor yet to a miscellany of ancient texts from which specialist scholars may one day sift out some edifying and generally acceptable maxims on religion and morals. Rather it is the appeal to the indispensable record of that divine revelation through Israel and the Incarnate Son which from the days of the apostles has moved the Christians to worship the Father through his Only Begotten Son in the fellowship of the Spirit. The place of understanding is in that worship.

HENRY BALMFORTH.

The Gaze of God

NICHOLAS of Cusa (1401-64) is comparatively unknown in this country, and in the whole realm of catholic spirituality has been singularly neglected in spite of his unique contribution towards it. It was not until 1932 that an English biography of, and commentary on, him appeared, and this was in a series specially designed "to produce a number of studies of various leading medieval Churchmen, more particularly of those who have not yet received their rightful meed of appreciation".[1]

Nicholas' work as a Church reformer, a protagonist for reunion with the Eastern Churches, an administrator for the papacy, an expert in canon law and a philosopher of importance can be seen by a study of his own writings[2] and by other writers' works on him.[3]

[1] Henry Bett: *Nicholas of Cusa*, p. v.

[2] *E.g., De concordantia catholica, De reparatione Calendarii, De auctoritate præsidendi in concilio generale, Epistolæ ad Bohemos, De coniecturis, De quærendo Deum, De dato Patris luminum, De filiatione Dei, Apologia doctæ ignorantiæ,* the *Idiota, De novissimis, Complementum theologicum, De pace seu concordantia fidei, De beryllo, De Possest, De non aliud, De venatione sapientiæ, Cribratio Alchorani* and a few more dialogues.

[3] Vansteenberghe's *Nicholas de Cues,* Scharpff's *Der Cardinal und Bischof Nicolaus von Cues als Reformator in Kirche, Reich und Philosophie,* Rotta's *Il Pensiero di Nicoli de Cusa,* Jaeger's *Der Streit des Cardinals Nicholaus mit dem Herzoge Sigmund von Oesterreich,* Deux's *Nicholaus von Cusa* and Uebinger's *Kardinallegat Nikolaus Cusanus in Deutschland* in *Historisches Jahrbuch der Goerres-Gesellschaft* (viii).

Here our concern is only with Nicholas' addition to mystical theology.

When he was Bishop of Brixen (now Bressanone) Nicholas had contact with the reformed Benedictine monastery of Tegernsee, whose monks had been impressed by reading his first philosophical work, *De docta ignorantia* (1440), and a friendship had developed between readers and writer. In June, 1452, Nicholas spent several days at the monastery, and the scholarly prior, Bernard de Waging, became his firm friend. In response to the monks' request that he should give them help in the practice of the spiritual life, he promised that he would do so. This promise was kept by sending to them in December, 1453, the book which he had specially written for them, namely, the *De visione Dei.*

Intellectually brilliant and administratively most competent, Nicholas knew much of difficulty and frustration. For him there was no leisured piety and studious relaxation. When he rose to be cardinal and bishop, his troubles increased. He was deeply involved in the trials and tensions of ecclesiastical and political organization, and often was obstructed by the perverse nature and subtle intrigue of certain men and women. In a sense he was a failure; certainly he was a sufferer.

As a student Nicholas had studied law and philosophy at Heidelberg and Padua. It was at the latter university that in 1423 he took his doctorate in canon law while still very young, and at this period his heart was set on a legal career. When he decided to seek ordination, he went for his theological training to Cologne.

His spiritual sources are quite obviously St Augustine, Dionysius the Areopagite, St Bernard, and St Thomas, but as a son of the Brethren of the Common Life—he had been educated at the song-school in Deventer which had been founded by Gerald Groote—he must have inherited much of Groote's and Ruysbroeck's spirituality. He was also the friend of Denis the Carthusian, whose ascetic writings are of supreme value, and a contemporary of Gerlac Petersen.

The *De visione Dei* has as its dedication "The Book of the Most Reverend Father and Lord in Christ, the Lord Nicholas of Cusa, Cardinal-Priest of St Peter in Chains, Bishop of Brixen, to the Abbot and Brethren of Tegernsee, concerning the Vision of God, or the Icon". Straight away the writer says that he will show his readers "an easy path unto mystical theology. For, knowing you to be led by zeal for God, I think you worthy of the opening up this treasure, as assuredly very precious and most fruitful."[1] In order to transport his readers to things divine, Nicholas says that he must employ a comparison of some kind, and he can imagine none more suitable than the omnivoyancy of a face in a picture. For the monks' understanding of, and instruction in, his teaching he actually sends such a portrait of a face, and from it he wishes them to learn the lesson of divine omnivoyancy and ubiquity. When this picture has been set

[1] *The Vision of God*, trans. Emma Gurney Salter (1928), p. 1. (This translation is used throughout this article.)

up in some place, the monks are to experiment with it by looking at it. No matter from what angle they examine it they will find that its eyes are looking at them as though they looked on none other. He who looks from the east at the picture will find that it is looking at him, but so will the monk who is at the west end. As one moves from east to west or from west to east, so one will find that the motionless face also moves and never lets one pass beyond its range. This picture, which Nicholas calls "the gaze of God",[1] is the means by which the writer intends "to uplift you, my most loving brethren, by a certain devotional exercise, unto mystical theology".[2]

The originality of Nicholas' thought about the vision of God is in his emphasis not on man beholding God, but on God beholding man. He is concerned with the Godward aspect of the vision. To him the vision of God quite literally means God seeing man, and always seeing him everywhere. He labours the point that everything depends on this divine aspect and initiative. "Thy look is Thy being. I am, because Thou didst look at me. If Thou didst turn Thy glance from me, I would cease to be."[3]

Nicholas' principal thesis might well be called a commentary on 2 *Chronicles* xvi, 9 or *Proverbs* xv, 3. "For the Eternal's eyes dart here and there over the whole world, as he exerts his power on behalf of those who are devoted to him." "The eyes of the Eternal are in every place, keeping watch upon the wicked and the good."[4] Whence did he get this novel idea of the gaze of God? No earlier known book on spirituality had ever dared so to treat the vision of God, nor has any subsequent work. It is possible that the idea had suddenly struck him as he looked at what he calls "the excellent pictures of such faces". As examples he mentions the picture of the archeress in Nuremberg's market-place, another picture in the governor's house in Brussels, the "Veronica" in his own chapel at Coblenz, and the angel holding the arms of the Church in the castle at Brixen.[5] Also St Augustine, to whom Nicholas is so indebted, with his insistence on the ever-present and inescapable God at times comes near to the metaphor of the gaze of God. One quotation alone can here be given: "Let the restless and unrighteous fly from Thee; yet Thou seest them, and Thine eye pierceth the darkness. And, behold, they live in a world of beauty, and they alone are vile. Whither did they fly, when they fled from Thy face? Where can they hide from Thee? They fled, that they might not see Thee who seest them. For in truth they knew not that Thou art everywhere, and that no place limits Thee, that Thou art also present even with those who go far from Thee."[6]

In his book Nicholas can never too strongly express the supreme concern of God for seeing, and so caring for and loving, the indi-

[1] Here I translate *visio* as "gaze" rather than as "vision".
[2] *The Vision of God*, p. 6.
[3] *The Vision of God*, p. 16.
[4] Moffatt's translation.
[5] It is also to be remembered that in his various contacts with the Eastern Church he would have seen their superb icons.
[6] *Confessions*, Bk v, ch. 2.

vidual soul; the relation of God to man is absolutely personal. "For Thou, the Absolute Being of all, art as entirely present to all (*i.e.* each) as though Thou hadst no care for any other. . . . Even so, Thou, Lord, dost regard every living thing in such wise that none of them can conceive that Thou hast any other care but that it alone should exist, in the best mode possible to it, and that each thinketh other existing things exist for the sole purpose of serving this end, namely, the best state of him whom Thou beholdest."[1] This indeed is but the parable of the lost sheep expressed in other language, and it is often repeated. "Hence Thou art ever with me, Lord; Thou desertest me not, Lord; on all sides Thou guardest me, for that Thou takest most diligent care of me. Thy Being, Lord, lettest not go of my being. I exist in that measure in which Thou art with me."[2] This seems to echo another part of the *Confessions* of St Augustine: "For I should not be, if Thou wert not in me. For I am not in hell, yet Thou art even there. For, though I go down into hell, Thou art there also. I should not be then. O my God, I should not be at all, unless Thou wert in me."[3]

Though Nicholas stresses so strongly the divine aspect of the *Visio Dei*, he makes quite clear that such implies more than the Creator seeing His creation from a distance. The heart of his mysticism is saved from any vagueness by his insistence on the catholic dogmas of the incarnation and revelation. "What else, Lord, is Thy seeing, when Thou beholdest me with pitying eye, than that Thou art seen of me? In beholding me Thou givest Thyself to be seen of me, Thou who art a hidden God. None can see Thee save in so far as Thou grantest a sight of Thyself, nor is that sight aught else than Thy seeing him who seeth Thee."[4] In the divine Son the God who gazes on man permits man to gaze on Him, and so the "great secret" of the incarnation is released. "Thou, my God, discloseth to me, a poor wretch, this so great secret that I may perceive that man cannot apprehend Thee, the Father, save in Thy Son, who may be apprehended and who is the mediator, and that to apprehend Thee is to be united to Thee. Man, then, can be united unto Thee through Thy Son, who is the means of union; and human nature most closely knit unto Thee, in whatsoever man it be, cannot be more united unto the intermediary than it is, for without an intermediary it cannot be united unto Thee."[5] In the love of Jesu the love of God is disclosed, and the incarnate Lord is the living photograph in time of the Eternal One. "Thus through the bounty of Thy grace I see in Thee, Jesu, Son of Man, the Son of God, and in the Son of God, the Father. Now, in Thee the Son of Man I see the Son of God, because Thou are both of these alike, and in Thy finite nature which is attracted I perceive the infinite nature which attracteth; in the absolute Son I behold the absolute Father,

[1] *The Vision of God*, pp. 14, 15.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 15, 16.
[3] *Confessions*, I, 2.
[4] *The Vision of God*, p. 20.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 94, 95.

for the Son cannot be seen as Son unless the Father be seen."[1] Rich indeed is this Fourth Gospel thought in Nicholas, and it is precisely this incarnational philosophy, so interwoven with deep piety, which saves Nicholas' mysticism from that which always hovers near the mystic's words—namely, looseness of phraseology and a detachment from pure Christology. To Nicholas Jesu is always the way, the truth, and the life as in Himself He unites the human and divine, and for His Father unites all human nature in Himself—this is the incomparable bliss, this is to be, even now, in Paradise.

Like all the genuine Christian mystics, Nicholas asserts that God is known by a "faculty" which rises above and beyond reason. Nor must it be forgotten that the writer was himself in the first flight of philosophers. "As a philosopher, he wrought out an intellectual system which is as profound as it is subtle, and which possesses a peculiar importance because of its unique relation, on the one hand, to the philosophy of the Middle Ages, and, on the other, to the philosophy of the Renaissance and of modern times. . . . The large place to which Nicholas is entitled in the history of philosophical thought has never been sufficiently recognized. There is, perhaps, no thinker of such real importance and of such wide influence who has been so singularly neglected."[2] Yet it is this master of thought who confesses the limitation of thought, and says that the way to God is beyond the intellectual and logical, even is barred until proud reason is overcome and discarded. The incarnate Lord is "utterly unknown to the wise of this world"[3] because they cannot accept the Christian "antitheses" of human and divine, finite and infinite, creator and creature. The Christian revelation is only known by those who cast aside the habit of presumption, and in faith are clothed with the robe of humility. "I give Thee thanks, my God, because Thou makest plain to me that there is none other way of approaching Thee than that which to all men, even the most learned philosophers, seemeth utterly inaccessible and impossible. For Thou hast shown me that Thou canst not be seen elsewhere than where impossibility meeteth and faceth me. Thou hast inspired me, Lord, who art the Food of the strong, to do violence to myself, because impossibility coincideth with necessity, and I have found that the place wherein Thou art found unveiled is girt about with the coincidence of contradictories, and this is the wall of Paradise wherein Thou dost dwell. The door whereof is guarded by the most proud spirit of reason, and, unless he be vanquished, the way in will not lie open."[4]

Jesu as the revelation of God made visible to man, and God as the beholding eye—daringly Nicholas has ejaculated "Thou art an Eye"[5]—are "the easy path unto mystical theology" which the monks are to learn. With this twin theme is allied the thought, coming

[1] *The Vision of God*, p. 98.
[2] Bett: *Nicholas of Cusa*, pp. 1 and 99.
[3] *The Vision of God*, p. 102.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 43, 44.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

both from St Augustine and St Bernard,[1] that what God has, He is. Because He has sight, He is sight. Because He has beauty, this having is being. He has all, is all, and all is in Him, save sin alone. "In all faces is seen the Face of faces."[2]

To see the Face, which sees all, is the supreme quest and the final knowledge. So one can but pray: "Feed me with Thy gaze, O Lord." Though ever seen, if man does not see the One who sees, he is lone and lost. Almost repeating St Augustine's famous words, Nicholas says: "My heart is not at rest, Lord, because Thy love hath inflamed it with so great desire that it can only rest in Thee."[3] Only by belief and love can man find the everlasting rest. "What teaching, good Jesu, was ever briefer and more effectual than Thine? Thou persuadest us but to believe, Thou biddest us but to love. What is easier than to believe in God? What is sweeter than to love Him? How pleasant is Thy yoke, how light Thy burden, Thou one and only Teacher!"[4]

So come the lovely words with which this strangely beautiful and delicately expressive gem of spirituality closes, as the mystic poet prayerfully sings: "Why then do I delay, why do I not run, in the sweet smell of the unguents of my Christ? Why do I not enter into the joy of my Lord? What restraineth me? If ignorance of Thee, Lord, hath held me back, and the empty delight of the world of sense, they shall restrain me no longer. For I desire, Lord (since Thou grantest me so to desire), to leave the things of this world, because the world desireth to leave me. I hasten towards the goal, I have all but finished my course, I will be beforehand with it in taking farewell, I who pant for my crown. Draw me, Lord, for none can come unto Thee save he be drawn by Thee; grant that, thus drawn, I may be set free from this world, and may be united unto Thee, the absolute God, in an eternity of glorious life. Amen."[5]

PATRICK COWLEY.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Sykes is Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge.

The Rev. H. Balmforth is a Canon of Ely Cathedral and Principal of Ely Theological College.

The Rev. P. Cowley is Diocesan Missioner in the diocese of York.

---

[1] "What God has that He is." St Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, xi, 10. "Dicitur recte et caritas, et Deus, et Dei donum." St Bernard: *De Diligendo Deo*, xii.
[2] *The Vision of God*, p. 26.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 34.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 124, 125.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 130.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE STATE OF THE DEPARTED

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

We must all be grateful for Mr Fuller's admirable discussion in your April number of the Biblical basis for prayers for the dead. In taking up my pen, I do not wish to be interpreted as disputing any of the conclusions which he argues so convincingly. But at one point I feel that he needs perhaps to be pushed a little further, if justice is to be done to the complete N.T. picture of the condition of those who "sleep in Jesus".

It is very true that the N.T. does not see the moment of death as the decisive one for the acquiring of the resurrection body, or indeed for anything else. It is only at the Parousia that it will be put on in its fullness, since the body, to the Hebrew, stands not, as it does in Hellenic thought, for the principle of individuation, but for corporate solidarity, whether in the old Adam or in the new. It is only at the Last Day that the Corpus will be complete and the new humanity stand forth in the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ, transformed to the likeness of His glorious Body.

Nevertheless, Mr Fuller does seem to do less than justice to the other great "moment" to which he draws attention—namely, that of baptism into the Holy Spirit. For it is here, at baptism, that the resurrection of the body begins, though it may not be complete till the End. Consequently, it is not enough to say of the dead simply that "they have *not yet* attained to the spiritual body" (italics his). Their position is not the same, as Prof. Cullman insists in the book he refers to, as that of the O.T. saints, for whom the resurrection body is merely future.

This is, I believe, the significance of the discussion in 2 Cor. v, 1-8, to which, unfortunately, Mr Fuller merely alludes. Its point is not *simply* that Christians, as he says, "will be 'clothed upon' with the spiritual body", but rather that "we know that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we *have* a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens". This cannot mean, as modern Christianity has interpreted it (in clear opposition to 1 Cor. xv), that we shall have a resurrection body immediately upon death. Rather, it is asserting that, even though the complete redemption and transformation of the body is an eschatological event, we Christians, whether alive or dead (for we all possess the earnest of the corporate Spirit—*v.* 5), *have already* "a Building from God, a House not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens", namely, *the Body of Christ*, the Church. This, and not their usual interpretation as speaking of an individual resurrection body, must be the meaning of these words. Such language elsewhere in the N.T. (the passages are usefully collected by Dr Selwyn in his commentary on 1 Peter, Additional Note H) is always used of the Church, the Body of Christ, the Temple of the living God.

Though there are parallels for the use of tent or tabernacle for the earthly frame, nothing is quoted for anything so solid as *oikodome* (building) as a metaphor for the individual resurrection body. Moreover, the echo of Mark xiv, 58, "I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will buiid another made without hands" (where the key words are all paralleled in 2 Cor. v, 1), suggests strongly, as Dr Selwyn insists, that Jesus' words were present to Paul's mind, and with them the necessary interpretation that "he spake of the temple of his body". Finally, the unbroken connexion between the closing verses of 2 Cor. iv and the beginning of ch. v makes it clear that the Apostle is referring to something that is already an active reality building up Christians here and now—not a body we have only when we die or at the Last Day, but the Body of Christ, which is not among the things that are decaying and will finally be dissolved, but is eternal, and ours already in the Spirit, renewing the inward man.

The difference between the quick and the dead is simply that the latter have been "unclothed" as far as the solidarity of this flesh-body is concerned. They, with us, wait fully to be incorporated in the new Body. But they are "with" the Lord not simply *despite the fact* that they have not yet attained to the resurrection of the body, but because like us they already have, proleptically, a share in the new corporeity of Christ. We are all in "the intermediate state": there is no difference. But this state is not simply one of waiting.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN ROBINSON.

14, VICARS' CLOSE, WELLS.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

In commenting on Mr Fuller's interesting article "Prayer for the Departed", I do not wish to be thought to identify myself with his position, for it seems to rest on St Paul rather than the New Testament as a whole, and his treatment of the Book of Common Prayer appears to draw inspiration more from the spirit of Tract XC than that of the Prayer Book itself, which speaks of "such language and order as is most easy and plain for the understanding both of the readers and hearers" (Concerning the Service of the Church).

But when he speaks of 2 Tim. i, 18, as a "unique example in the New Testament of prayer for the departed" (presuming Onesiphorus to be dead), I wonder whether he has remembered 1 Cor. xv, 29? Does not the practice of Baptism for the dead strengthen his position? J. K. Mozley's comment on this difficult verse seems very fair: "St Paul shows no sign of thinking it an illegitimate practice. Andrews, in the chapter he contributes to Forsyth's Lectures on the Church and Sacraments, speaks of thirty-six interpretations, thirty-five of which evade the clear sense, which is that baptism conveyed some spiritual endowment, otherwise unobtainable." We are not concerned here to approve or disapprove the practice: the fact is that

it existed. The living could assist in altering the status of the dead. Moreover there is no N.T. evidence that any sacrament was to be administered without prayer. Baptism for the dead included and presupposed prayer for the dead.

Yours faithfully,

H. W. MONTEFIORE.

4, WOODTHORNE ROAD,
NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE 2.

THE FAST BEFORE COMMUNION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

It has occurred to me, after reading Mr Dunstan's article in your February issue on "The Fast Before Communion", that some of your readers might be interested in my recollections of the attitude towards this custom of that great Roman Catholic Christian, the late Baron Friedrich von Hügel. He once, as he told me, disappointed an Anglican lady who had asked to be introduced to him and opened the conversation with an expression of her sympathy with the Roman Catholic Church, especially on account of its strict insistence upon the fast before Communion, by his reply. "No doubt," he said, "there are many very excellent reasons for this rule, but you must bear in mind that the Pope could abolish it to-morrow by a stroke of the pen." Baron von Hügel himself held, in consideration of his weak health, dispensations both from ordinary fasting and from the fast before Communion. Of the former he freely availed himself, of the latter rarely and reluctantly. When staying on a Sunday at a distance from a Roman Catholic church, and without other means of transport, he would, if it were not far, start to walk to an early mass with biscuits in his pocket, in case his strength should fail before he reached it; if it did, he would eat them, but would not on that occasion communicate. On an Anglican girl, whose own Church did not, as he knew, subject her to the rule, he urged the reception of Holy Communion under conditions incompatible with its observance (*Select Letters*, p. 323).

Yours faithfully,

PITCHCOTT, AYLESBURY.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

THE MOTHER OF GOD

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

In the Ecumenical Conversation which Mr Basil Moss seeks to describe, the Eastern Orthodox chose the subject, about which they have much to say which has not been heard in Western Christendom for a long time. Mr Moss might, I think, have realized this, and might have devoted more space and more thought to the accurate and fair reporting of what the Easterns said. It would not matter that he did not, if it was likely that the book would be widely read and if he had said that it ought to be widely read, for the sake of the Orthodox contributions alone; but he does not thus

mitigate his most astonishing distortions of what the Orthodox standpoint is. The title of the book will ensure that it is not bought where it is most important that it should be bought and read, unless some encouragement is given.

1. "Apart from Church Tradition, theology would be dumb." This is a quotation from Lossky; but the meaning of tradition and the meaning of the "*apophasis*" here recommended elude Mr Moss. Thus he quotes, or almost quotes, "*the main stem*"; but he says that, for the Orthodox, this stem of the tradition "is the contrast, first found in Justin and Irenæus, between the 'two virgins' . . . disobedient and obedient". In Lossky, in fact, "*the main stem*" of the tradition is quite definitely within Scripture. The memory of the events of our Lord's infancy, preserved in his family circle and then among his disciples (not their *preaching* to the Jews and the Gentiles, but their *teaching* to those who were already in the Church) is the "germ and stem" of Church Tradition in general. "Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart" (Luke ii, 19, 51). The connexion seen by Lossky between this, the Parable of the Sower, the episode of the Mother and Brethren of Jesus (Mark iii, etc.) and the dialogue in which Mary seems to be abased (Luke xi, 27-28), is a piece of very serious, original, and important exegesis. Both Fr Florovsky and Professor Lossky, the latter particularly, insist that Tradition does not mean authoritative statements only, in the Eastern context. Tradition means primarily the fact that a member of the Church, living a "Church-life", can see in the Bible and in the documents of Church history what a student of comparative religion or a secular historian cannot see. This is not to oppose free theological inquiry; it is to give to that free inquiry more material, more data, than those provided by the "*impartial*" scientific investigation of Christian origins. The whole question of infallibility in orthodox theology is too huge and thorny for consideration here. Theology may be cumulative in more than one sense and does not cease, by being cumulative, to be reformable. The contrast is here grossly over-simplified.

2. "If she anticipated that grace . . . it was by God's free gift, not in virtue of the natural connexion." This is not what the Easterns say. The "natural connexion", or "the fact of maternity", is itself God's free gift of grace. The contrast made in the Eastern Orthodox papers is between that fact, as a fact of history given, and the personal sanctity of Mary. It is indeed the contrast between the Mother-Child relationship and the Mother-Grown-up-Son relationship, in part. So Fr Florovsky says "virginity is not . . . a physical feature as such . . . it is a spiritual and inner attitude . . . freedom from passions . . . a complete self-dedication" (pp. 60, 61). Mary is seen in the Church on the Day of Pentecost, identified with the Church, not simply as one of the disciples but as their Mother helping them to be one with her Son, and showing them what she had so long kept in her heart, the secret of the Messiah, seen by the "pure in heart", involving the Christian understanding of the Old Testament.

3. "Both Lossky and Florovsky insist that Mary was born and lived under the law of original sin." What is actually said against the "Western Catholic" formulation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, in these Eastern Orthodox papers, is very guarded and careful. Lossky points out that other people besides Mary were involved in the preparation of the Incarnation and were predestined for their parts in the work of preparation from the very beginnings of their existence. The gift of grace given to Mary must have been unique. But other unique gifts were given to others. Fr Florovsky says that there is a problem involved to which the Roman Catholic solution is "valid in the context of a particular and highly inadequate doctrine of original sin". He points out that, according to the Roman Church, Mary is not so set apart as to destroy her "essential solidarity" with us or the "consubstantiality with us" of the Son of God. It is not to be denied and none seek to deny that she was a partaker of the "common humanity" of a fallen race; so was her Son also. The point at issue between some Eastern theologians and the definition of 1854 concerns, very largely, what "personal original sin" is considered to be and how far human people can be said to be "*sinners*" before they actually commit sins. It also concerns the Incarnation and the Redemption as the turning-point of history. What the Easterns are ready to emphasize (in a way that can *seem* Pelagian) is the role of the Free Will of Man in preparing—and even causing—the intervention of God. However old I grow it remains true that it is to my mother that I owe my existence. Mr Moss discusses the Scriptural data without a reference to "Behold the handmaid of the Lord". He assumes that "*dependence*" on Mary must be separated from "*dependence*" (it is his word, not that of the writers) on Israel, on the Old Testament covenant, on human freedom in every generation; the truth at stake is that God in creation, in redemption, in sanctification, makes His work "*depend*" on human agency. I could understand an attack on this standpoint from the point of view of the "*Sola Dei gloria*" of the Reformation. But calmly to disregard its existence in an account of an Ecumenical Conversation, or to treat it as obviously "unwarranted", is curious.

4. "There was a compensation of holiness in her person, adequate to her function." This is not a quotation from some incomprehensible bit of mysticism, as one might expect. It is either bad proofreading, or a piece of "Eastern incomprehensibility" invented by the Anglican reviewer.

I will not occupy space with any continuation of the Anglican "private war" into which the Orthodox contributions were dragged. The title of the article by Basil Moss might have been "Anglicanism's many discordant voices in Ecumenical Conversation", and he might have made a valuable plea to the theologians whom he regards as in the "main stream of Anglican divinity" that they should "come over into Macedonia" and give some positive assistance in conversations with the Orthodox, where they are always welcome, when they appear on the scene. The doors are not closed. But we cannot compel them to come in, when they all excuse themselves

from speaking on subjects which the Orthodox have proposed. The Orthodox were made perfectly well aware of the limited character of the "representativeness" of the Anglican speaking team, and this is stressed, almost to excess, in the book.

Yours faithfully,
EDWARD EVERY.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I do not want to join in any controversy about Mariology. Still less do I want to take sides with either Mr Basil Moss or Dr Eric Mascall against the other. But may I protest against the incursion of psychological chitchat into a theological argument? I refer to the passage in Mr Moss's article in your April number where he suggests that "Catholic" Mariology may be "the spiritual projection of retarded adolescence". This is all of a piece with a kind of Anglican apologetic, fashionable in certain circles to-day, which presents Anglicanism as the fully adult religion and therefore superior to Roman Catholicism which, like the Kingdom of God, is suitable really only for children. I believe that all such arguments do nothing but harm to the church they are intended to support.

1. Theology is concerned with the question "Is it true?" and if so, "How and in what sense is it true?" And this leads to the bigger question, "What is the nature of the evidence and authority by which its truth is established?" But the non-Christian intellectual middle-classes, proud of their flirtation with such big-wigs as the psychologists, ask, not "Is it true?" but "Why does he believe that?" And the answers are not so much cooked as extracted from a tin—"Because, emotionally, he is still an adolescent"; or "because he has a mother-fixation"; or "because" (as somebody once said of Hamlet) "he was brought up by his nurse"; or "because his parents wanted a girl instead of a boy". Once, however, we admit this sort of argument into a theological discussion, we shall find the most fundamental Christian doctrines psychologized away. Psychologists, after all, talk of fathers as well as mothers. Why do I believe in a Father in Heaven by whom the very hairs of my head are numbered? Can it be because I am not yet grown up, and, feeling insecure without the shielding presence of Daddy, project that feeling into the empty infinite?

2. If, however, the terms "adolescent" and "adult" are used analogically to describe *spiritual* states, can we say that the church militant here in earth was ever meant to be composed of *spiritual* adults? That is the heresy of every perfectionist sect. When Mr Moss dismisses a doctrine because it is "the spiritual projection of retarded adolescence", is he claiming that the Anglican is not a spiritual adolescent, but has already developed into a full-grown man, into the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ?

3. I cannot forget the parable of Jesus—"Bring hither the poor, the maimed, the blind, and the lame." I am an Anglican because I know that the Anglican church is capable of doing this, and has (in

my own case, for instance) done it. But can I therefore argue against a doctrine that it is too congenial to the spiritually (and psychologically) poor and maimed and blind and lame? Should I not then claim, Pharisee-like, to be too superior a person for the gospel?

Such a kind of argument and apologetic will end only by claiming to show that the Anglican church has not the mind of Christ.

Yours faithfully,

H. A. Williams.

Westcott House,
Cambridge.

BOOK REVIEWS

Authority in the Apostolic Age. By R. R. Williams. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

What place has authority in religion? If by religion is meant the secret reliance of the soul on God, the answer is that religion can no more be controlled by authority than the love of a man for his friend. The wind bloweth where it listeth; so is everyone that is born of the Spirit. Saints and mystics have seldom been amenable to the discipline of an organization. But religion has other meanings. Christianity is a great historical movement associated with definite intellectual convictions, a definite ethical outlook, and the life of an organized society. Once an organization appears the question of authority becomes both relevant and urgent.

The value of the Church to religion has been variously estimated, even as its nature has been variously conceived. It has been the object of a fanatical devotion, and it has been called a necessary evil. It has helped, and it has hindered, the Gospel of Christ. But that the Church is as old as Christianity cannot be denied. Christians have faced the world not as solitary speculators or lonely mystics, but as members of the body of Christ. And to exist at all a society must hold together. At least ideally, its members must treasure the same convictions and pursue the same aims. They must respect the same code of conduct and submit to a common discipline. As an organization grows it will increase in complexity and scope. Where is the binding link to be found?

This is the question which Mr Williams sets himself to answer in his study of the Apostolic Church, and giving to the word "authority" a wide and somewhat variable meaning he surveys in detail the apostolic writings. He begins with an examination of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, an epistle which introduces so many features of early Christian life and thought. There, in the solution of the various problems of a Gentile Christian community, we see authority, particularly apostolic authority, in action, and we may infer the grounds on which questions were decided. He passes to consider the authority of history, the influence of current traditions as to the life and teaching of Christ. His third and fourth chapters deal with the place of the early Christian ministry. Next he discusses "the authority of dynamic happenings" and of the conviction of the intervention of divine power which was fundamental to the

outlook of the early Christians. In his sixth chapter he deals with the authority of common practice and discusses the sacraments. The last chapter is concerned with the authority of Christ in His Church. The book ends with a short essay on the modern discussion of authority in religion and in the Church, and a longer essay on the contemporary problem of authority.

It will be seen that the author has set himself a formidable task in his endeavour to cover so wide a field in 140 pages. Most of the problems of New Testament exposition are at least glanced at, and although in some parts the examination of the evidence may appear inadequate, Mr Williams has evidently made a close study of the subjects on which he touches, and he has maintained throughout a sane and scholarly attitude. Inevitably, some of his conclusions will be challenged, but few will deny that within its limits the book represents a very solid achievement. Mr Williams' summary may be quoted:

"The authority recognized in the apostolic age was the authority of God, asserted in history by Christ, His vice-regent. This was conveyed to individual Christians and Christian groups in a variety of ways. There was the record of Christ's deeds and words, which could be personally known and increasingly appropriated by all. There was the existence of a ministry felt to be commissioned by Him. There was, too, the sense of His immediate presence, made real and vivid by His indwelling Spirit. Every man had to be fully persuaded in his own mind concerning his own actions, but actions which concerned larger groups and more far-reaching issues called for more formal decision, which was reached either by apostolic *fiat* or by conciliar discussion with prayer for the guidance of the Spirit. No one channel could be regarded as monopolizing the right to mediate Christ's authority. The right, if it lay anywhere, lay in the whole Church, and then only in so far as the whole Church was obedient and responsive to the Spirit. Life in the apostolic Church was life in a complex of relationships, through each and all of which Christ's authority was at work."

That is surely well said.

P. Gardner-Smith.

Jesus College,
Cambridge.

Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium. (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 18.) By C. Maurer. Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich. 9.80 Swiss francs.

Though Dr Maurer's title may seem to suggest a work of rather specialized interest, this impression is very soon modified by reading the book itself. The author sees the problem of determining the relationship of Ignatius to the Fourth Gospel in a wider context, and raises issues of importance to all students of the New Testament and the early history of Christian doctrine. Though it is unlikely that all his views will win general acceptance, it cannot be denied that Dr Maurer has made an interesting and important contribution to the literature on this subject.

His thesis is that Ignatius and the author of the Fourth Gospel both belong to a group of "Syrian" Christians who may be identified not only by their common vocabulary and range of ideas, but also by a characteristic method of quoting other writings—combining passages from different contexts and freely adapting them to convey meanings quite different from those intended by their original authors. The fact that the Fourth Evangelist and Ignatius share this peculiar "syncretistic" method of quotation is an important feature of the author's thesis, and he is at pains to demonstrate it from the Fourth Evangelist's use of the Synoptic Gospels and from Ignatius' use of the Fourth Gospel. But he fails to establish that there is anything really unique in this method—it is in fact a common practice of the early Fathers, and of any writer who is as familiar as they were with the Scriptures. Moreover the writers who use this allusive "syncretistic" method also quote on occasion sufficiently exactly to make it beyond doubt that they are using a particular source. But the affinities between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics and Ignatius and the Fourth Gospel are such that one may reasonably doubt in the latter case what is often questioned in the former—namely, whether the later writer was in fact acquainted with his predecessor. That Ignatius and the Fourth Evangelist have the same vocabulary and range of ideas is obvious, but the author has not convinced one reader at least that Ignatius used the Fourth Gospel.

He is, however, confident that Ignatius read the Fourth Gospel, and proceeds to the interesting suggestion that Ignatius was the first of many who misinterpreted the Gospel. This he attempts to prove by a careful comparison of the meanings which they attach to such terms as "truth", "light", and "life", and of their leading theological ideas. If one grants that Ignatius *is* trying to interpret the Fourth Gospel, then it is clear that Dr Maurer is right in claiming that he misunderstood it. He maintains that though both the Fourth Evangelist and Ignatius used "gnostic" terminology, we must "draw the line between gnosis and gospel, not between Ignatius and his opponents, but between John and Ignatius" (p. 101), because John's theology is firmly anchored in the Biblical revelation, while that of Ignatius is not, a conclusion with which this reviewer is in full agreement.

PETERHOUSE,
CAMBRIDGE.

J. N. SANDERS.

THE EPISTLE OF DIOGNETUS. The Greek Text with Introduction, Translation, and Notes. By H. G. Meecham. Manchester University Press. 18s.

Principal Meecham has given us an excellent little edition of the Epistle of Diognetus, the only early Patristic writing which can fairly be described as charming. The introductory matter covers some seventy-three pages. Text, translation, commentary, together with another ten pages of additional notes, complete the edition.

The text and verbal commentary are well done and the length of the prefatory material made it possible to reduce the commentary proper to reasonable proportions. Linguistically he is well equipped for his task. He is a master of Greek language and literature and his knowledge of Jewish Hellenistic literature has special significance for his subject.

In his introductory matter, all the relevant data are conveniently collected and briefly discussed. His judgment in discussing the various theories with regard to authorship is admirably discriminating and reserved. A fuller discussion of the evidence for the Hippolytan authorship of the closing chapters might well have been included, although detailed points bearing upon this disputed matter occur in different parts of the commentary. He is perhaps happier in his reference of the work to its apologetic background than in his treatment of the matters of theology contained in the book itself. Second-century Christianity is in any case a difficult subject, as the number of concomitant variables involved is extremely high and the evidence is neither extensive nor readily to be interpreted. The argument from silence is normally used with caution, though on pp. 31 and 47 it might have been maintained with even greater effect. It really will not do to hail the writer as holding an eschatology approaching to the "realized" type, and it is rather straining a modern interpretation out of the writer to maintain that "it is rather the resurrection life lived in this world that is in clear view" The eschatology of the Apologists was not so clearly integrated as to make such inferences possible, especially as anyway "the author is economical in his statement of Christian belief".

The most debatable point in the whole work is Appended Note B. The writer has evidently missed the most important treatment of the subject by Jules Gross, "La divinisation du chrétien d'après les pères grecs". There is certainly the relative use of the terms God and Deification in later pagan circles, a certain bowdlerization of the words which was the product not so much of faith as of scepticism. But this has little to do with either the Christian predication of the attribute of Godhead to our Lord or with the theme of the deification of Christians which was consequent upon it. The development of the doctrines of the Incarnation and of redemption would have had a far easier passage and a widely different phrasing if this had been so. Yet Dr Meecham passes at once from a passage in the Acts of John to the early phrasings of the doctrine of deification in Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, and Gregory of Nazianzus. The material quoted by Gross from Athanasius and Gregory of Nyssa is alike more representative and less misleading.

These reservations apart, Dr Meecham has offered us a scholarly and learned edition of the Epistle of Diognetus, but its merits lie rather on the thorough treatment of linguistic and background problems than on its interpretation of the theological themes of the letter which is sometimes superficial and occasionally misleading.

H. E. W. Turner.

Lincoln College,
Oxford.

THE RITES OF EASTERN CHRISTENDOM. By Archdale A. King. Burns Oates. 2 vols. £3 3s.

These two volumes have been magnificently produced by the *Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana* in Rome, with a foreword by Mgr Godfrey, the Apostolic Delegate in Great Britain, copious notes and references, and many photographs of oriental ecclesiastics in every variety of costume, with some of architecture, ikons, liturgical instruments, and ceremonial. They contain summary accounts of the action and ceremonies of every oriental liturgy, with some quotations from the text, and notes on architecture, ornaments, furniture, liturgical language, sacramental elements, and all other *minutiæ*. These have been checked by experts, priests of the rite in the case of churches in communion with Rome, and are probably fairly reliable. The historical and theological matter is more questionable. To some extent no doubt it suffers from the attentions of oriental experts with axes to grind, like the devout Syrian who suggested that

> *Syriac*, an idiom of Hebrew, is said to have been spoken by our Lord himself, and in looking at the title of the cross it is of interest to consider that the inscription on it was written in the three great liturgical languages of the world: Latin, Greek, and Syriac. (Vol. I, p. 8.)

The compiler is clearly sceptical of edifying attempts to prove the perpetual orthodoxy of the Maronites and the Malabarese, but he cannot, out of politeness to his friends, who have checked his account of their rites, exclude fairly full references to literature of this nature; and in his reserve to avoid committing himself to fantasies he sometimes goes too far in the other direction, and writes as if the line between schism and communion with Rome were clearer than it is.

Perhaps the chief interest of this book for Anglicans, other than experts on Eastern liturgies, who will know most of the material already, lies in its incidental illustration of the difficulty that Rome has always had in determining the limits of the visible Church. Roman Catholic writers on oriental history are torn between the desire to produce independent testimony, from outside the *milieu* of Western Christendom, to the primacy of the Holy See, and a reluctance to admit the long-continued existence of groups whose communion with Rome did not exclude relations with schismatics or heretics. Mr King has taken fewer pains than others to conceal his inconsistencies. He writes (Vol. II, p. 8):

> The Norman conquest of *Magna Grecia* providentially saved the Italo-Greeks from sharing in the schism of Michael Caerularius (1053), and the majority of the people remained in communion with the Apostolic see.

He does not notice that the Norman conquest took place before and *after* 1054, nor does he observe the continued communion of Constantinople with Sicily and Calabria in the Middle Ages. The Greeks and Albanians whose arrival in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries preserved the Greek churches of southern Italy were Eastern Orthodox on one side of the Adriatic and Roman Catholic on the other. Distrust of their perfect loyalty was probably responsible for the suppression of the Byzantine rite in many places after

their arrival. The Melkites of Syria are another group who long remained in touch with Rome and Constantinople. The name is now appropriated by general consent to those in communion with Rome, who have a much better claim to continuous orthodoxy and almost continuous communion with the West than the Maronites, who have copious literature, mainly legendary. The Maronites have the advantage of not being compromised by a special relationship with a dissident church, even if the study of their liturgical literature suggests a great deal of Jacobite and some Nestorian infiltration.

The most tangled story of all is that of the Malabarese. I cannot commend Mr King's way of telling it, which involves a division between the Syro-Malankara rite in volume I, chapter iv, after the Maronites, and the Syro-Malabar rite in volume II, chapter ix, after the Chaldæans. But if the material in these chapters is collated with the confusing story of the three lines of East Syrian Patriarchs in chapter viii, a patient reader may reconstruct a tragedy of mystification. It is evident that the Portuguese Jesuits in charge of missions in Malabar could never be sure which Patriarch of Babylon might be in communion with Rome at any particular time. Any envoy from Mesopotamia could be considered, with much plausibility, as a suspected heretic. As late as 1877 a schism seems to have arisen in Malabar through the intervention of the Chaldæan Patriarch Mar Audo, who was never on good terms with Pius IX, in disputes between the Malabarese and the local Latin authorities.

Mr King has no objection to quoting from time to time some typical utterances of Latin objectors to any rite but the Roman, notably Dom Guéranger of Solesmes. The change in accent in official Roman pronouncements since the sixteenth century from toleration to correction and from correction to preservation of other liturgies is significant. It is probably true to say that the status of Eastern rites in the Roman church is higher to-day than at any time since the slow decline of the Greek and Syrian rites in Rome itself. Mr King does not stress the polyglot character of the Roman church in the narrower sense until the middle of the eleventh century. His learning is rather of the sacristy than of the study. No one could call this book essential, but the photographs are very ornamental.

George Every, S.S.M.

Kelham.

The Jews from Cyrus to Herod. By Norman H. Snaith. Religious Education Press. 6s.

This book of just over 200 pages by a well-known Old Testament scholar forms one of the "Gateway Handbooks of Religious Knowledge" under the general editorship of Dr Basil A. Yeaxlee. Let it be said at once that its value is out of all proportion to its size. It fills a real gap in the literature on the inter-Testamental period, including, as it does, in a single volume a short but scholarly treatment of topics only dealt with elsewhere separately in larger works or in Bible dictionaries.

The first quarter of the book gives a sketch of the general political history of the Near East from 626 B.C. to A.D. 70. It says much for the author that, in spite of extreme compression, he manages to make his survey readable and interesting.

The remainder of the book he devotes to tracing the development of religious ideas among the Jews of "The Return".

Dr Snaith accepts the "Ideal Israel" theory of the "Servant Songs" of Deutero-Isaiah, but goes further and identifies "the Servant" with the Jews of the first deportation in 597 B.C., "the very good figs" of Jeremiah xxiv. These returning exiles, "The Servant who has suffered", but whose sufferings are now over, brought back with them three convictions, around which everything subsequent to 538 B.C. revolves.

(*a*) *That there was but One God, supreme in Wisdom and Power.* Dr Snaith shows how, with the increasing emphasis on the transcendence of God, there arose the problem concerning contact between Creator and Created. In chapters entitled "Demons and Angels", "Wisdom", and "The Logos" he shows how Persian, native Hebrew and Greek ideas respectively contributed towards the solution of a problem, only finally resolved by the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation.

(*b*) *That they and they alone were the true Israel, the people of God.* Such a conviction was bound to lead to an exclusionist policy, and in his chapter "Separatism" the author fully explains a feature which, in varying degree, has been a characteristic of Jewry throughout the ages. Such separatist behaviour involved the strictest observance of the Law (Torah). His discussion of this, tracing the development of the Oral Tradition, should prove helpful to students of the Gospels and Pauline Epistles.

(*c*) *That this One God would see to it that they, His chosen people, would accomplish a glorious destiny at the head of the nations.* In so far as this glorious future is conceived of as coming in the ordinary course of history it is associated with the Messianic King, though Dr Snaith is careful to point out that the word "Messiah" in the Old Testament is nowhere used as a title, its first occurrence in that sense being in the Psalms of Solomon (first century B.C.). In face of repeated disappointments the Jews were gradually forced to a realization that the advent of the Kingdom could result only from divine intervention. Hence the apocalyptic setting with its conception of the "Son of Man" whose personal aspect comes to the front in the Book of Enoch.

Short chapters are included on the Jewish ideas of an after-life, on the Temple and Synagogue, and on the chief Jewish religious sects. There are a short but sufficient bibliography and a full index. The publishers are to be congratulated on the book's pleasing format.

O. Mordaunt Burrows.

Epworth Rectory,
Doncaster.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST PETER. By C. E. B. Cranfield.
THE REVELATION OF ST JOHN THE DIVINE. By R. H. Preston and A. T. Hanson. S.C.M. Press. 7s .6d. each.

"We need to bear these historical considerations in mind . . . but let no one draw the conclusion that what St Peter says must therefore be out of date and irrelevant" (On 1 Pet. 3. 1 f.). In such words the author directs his historical scholarship to an avowedly pastoral end. His confident assumption of Petrine authorship enables him to interpret the epistle in the light of the gospel portrait of Peter the pastor in training. "We have to think out afresh what pastoral care really means, and this passage will help us to do it" (On 5. 1 f.).

A hint in the preface confirms our guess that much of what is written is based on sermons—an appropriate method if, as the author holds, 1 Peter 1. 1.-4. 11 was itself originally an Easter sermon. Those who preach or listen to sermons may well be glad to appropriate what is said, for example, of apostleship and election (On 1. 1 f.), of holiness (On 1. 13 f.), of the state (On 2. 13 f.), and especially of the modern cult of youth (On 5. 5 f.).

Possibly, however, even granted the pastoral, popular intention, we have here too much drawing of the moral, too little "scientific" commenting. For instance, the contemporary climate of thought is summarized by a quotation from Sophocles (no reference is given), who after all did live half a millennium previously. And is it pedantic to expect an index of biblical references, or lazy to hope for the English text printed at the top of each section?

Both these latter are omitted from *The Revelation*—the former surprisingly, since the authors expressly encourage "a judicious looking-up of cross-references" (p. 11). Here, however, is a gallant attempt to make Revelation popularly intelligible, as has not been possible (so the authors boldly claim) before the advent of modern historical science. Details invite disagreement. Was not the canon of Scripture effectively closed before the fifth century (p. 17)? More serious is an apparent concession to the temper of our age in the repeated suggestion (see on 11. 18; 14. 10, 11; 22. 11) that the "wrath of God" is but an impersonal automatic consequence of sin. St John the Divine does not so depersonalize the relation between God and unrepentant man. But here in general is deeply Christian commentary. John's fantastic imagery is seen in the light of Christ Crucified. It is in His own blood, not in that of His enemies, that the vesture of the Word of God is dipped (Rev. xix, 13).

The occasional applications to "the atomic era" (the last words in the book) are not always happy. We read of those who, "Horrified at the realities of the atomic era, try to find solace and escape in art and music" (p. 82). What sort of prejudice is this? Can it, by the way, obscurely account for the neglect of the importance of the liturgical background to Revelation, which the authors dismiss in one sentence (p. 46)?

The hungry sheep look up. In such books as these the S.C.M. Press provides, as a necessary ingredient in their diet, the fruits of

biblical theology, rendered assimilable to discerning popular taste and digestion. As this reviewer ponders to which of his lay friends he will seek to lend these books he finds himself asking: After which kind do those who will take the trouble to read commentaries really hunger? That which continually draws the moral, makes the contemporary application, or that which sets out simply to present "the facts" of modern biblical science? Teachers in the Workers' Educational Association may well come nearest the answer.

A. H. DAMMERS.

ANDERTON,
CHORLEY,
LANCS.

SHORTER NOTICES

INITIUM OMNIS PECCATI SUPERBIA. Augustine on Pride as the First Sin. By William M. Green. University of California Press.

Reinhold Niebuhr has pointed out that the doctrine that pride is the first and basic sin is characteristic of the teaching of Augustine, and has been maintained "in the strain of theology generally known as Augustinian". It is surprising that no monograph has been devoted to this subject, which Mr Green opens up. He first gives a brief catena of the important relevant passages from Augustine's writings, early as well as later, and goes on to trace the "sources" of the doctrine (i) in the Bible, (ii) indirectly in the Greek notion of ὕβρις as developed by Plato, and (iii) in Plotinus, whose very phrases are found to be worked into the *Genesis contra Manichæos*, 2, 9, 12. Finally an attempt is made to show the significance of the doctrine in Augustine's thought by a close study of the *Confessions*, where pride is repeatedly asserted to have been the principal barrier to his acceptance of Christian faith, and a sin not wholly subdued within himself especially in the form of love of praise. The characteristic Augustinian doctrine of grace, it is suggested, is the "sequel to his earlier conviction that the beginning of all sin is pride".

We are here brought to the very heart of Augustinianism, and of the contrast between Christianity and Græco-Roman pagan culture. In Augustine's day hostility to Christianity had ceased to be an attitude of the populace, and was largely confined to the educated. From personal experience he knew well the obstacle presented to simple faith by contemporary culture proud of its learning and elegance, its rational and ethical achievement. In *The City of God*, from the Preface onwards, he recognizes that his real opponents are the proud who can hardly be persuaded how great is the virtue of humility. Hence like St Paul he realizes that the works of righteousness, or at any rate confidence in them, must be annihilated before the Gospel can be fully accepted. The Dark Age falling on the ancient world as a necessary prelude to the Christian Middle Ages suggests that history endorses his judgment.

JOHN H. S. BURLEIGH.

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST JOHN. By F. R. Hoare. Burns Oates. 6s. 6d.

Mr Hoare has arranged the text according to the argument of his *Original Order of St John's Gospel* (reviewed in THEOLOGY, May, 1945). Such arguments appear in the end to demand some genius deliberately and extensively to have transposed the sheets of the gospel codex from their "original order" into their canonical order. And it is the latter that the plain reader may well call upon the critics to interpret.

In his preface the translator respectfully distinguishes the aim of his own experiment with the Greek from that of the authoritative version from the Latin of Mgr Knox. But he scornfully dismisses the "old word for word tradition" embodied in the "Anglican Authorized Version with its long stretches of dog-English on the level of Fourth Form translationese".

It would be uncharitable to a careful scholar to dismiss this judgment of value as mere prejudice or bravado, without exemplifying his intention and method. *ἐδάκρυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς* (John xi, 35)—"Jesus wept". The word-for-word tradition conveys a never-to-be-forgotten impression of the Son of Man. Mr Hoare has: "Then Jesus let the tears come." He would remind us, it seems, of the Gospel's consistent overtone, that sense of the Almighty Word in control of every situation. Or again: *ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν* (John i, 1). Mr Hoare has: "The Thought was in God." A long footnote identifies the Logos with St Augustine's "verbum mentis". But surely we believe that the "verbum mentis" of God is expressed before all worlds. Moreover, the theme of the Prologue is the communication of this "verbum mentis" to ourselves. Thought pre-existently expressed and in the Incarnation communicated is Word. Were it "Thought", then "in God" were right. But as it is "Word", "with God" is right. As St John Chrysostum comments: "He does not say was 'in God', but was *with God*; declaring to us His eternity as to person." And therefore with due respect and to avoid confusion of Persons; not "the Thought was in God", but "the Word was with God".

But Mr Hoare is not merely provocative. He often succeeds in catching something of the deceptive simplicity of manner, the precision and subtlety of matter of the inspired original. Even in refusing to translate Logos by Word, he is, perhaps unwillingly, in very distinguished company. Is it not probable that Goethe intended to endorse his Faust's presumption in translating: "In the beginning was the Act"?

A. H. DAMMERS.

ANDERTON,
CHORLEY.

SYLLABUS OF CHURCH TEACHING AND PRAYER BOOK INSTRUCTION (Dioceses of London and Southwark). S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

Since the passing of the 1944 Education Act, several notable agreed syllabi of religious instruction have been published by the counties. In their avoidance of mere moralism, in their teaching about the development of the Church and the Creed, they show a

welcome advance towards a post-critical biblical theology, as the Bishop of Bristol wrote in the foreword of the L.C.C. Syllabus in 1947. Their theology, however, still lacks full integration. It is just this integration in the life and teaching of the Church that church schools should be able to provide, yet, often, it is just here the church school fails. The Dioceses of London and Southwark first published their new syllabus in 1944 to be used in conjunction with the various agreed syllabi used in these dioceses: this new edition has cross-references to the new agreed syllabi. It should, of course, be in the hands of every church school teacher and manager in those dioceses, and indeed in other dioceses not so well provided. How far the courses of church instruction can be actually woven together with those of the agreed syllabi is doubtful: often the two courses must be taught side by side. However, the clear teaching of the diocesan syllabus on the Creed, the Church, and the Sacraments will, as the cross-references show, again and again, tie up the biblical teaching of the agreed syllabus. Though it errs on the side of brevity, this syllabus provides the integration without which any teaching of the Christian faith is ineffective and largely wasted.

TOTTENHAM. J. H. CHURCHILL.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

BURNS OATES: Denis G. Murphy, *The Sacristan's Manual* (10s. 6d.); Frederick Copleston, S.J., *A History of Philosophy, Vol. II* (25s.).

CHURCH LITERATURE ASSOCIATION: H. A. Wilson, *The Hands of a Priest* (4d.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: W. D. Davies, *A Normative Pattern of Church Life in the New Testament: Fact or Fancy?* (1s.).

COLLEGE OF ST MARK AND ST JOHN (CHELSEA): T. W. Eason and R. Hamilton (Ed.), *A Portrait of Michael Roberts.*

EPWORTH PRESS: Margaret Steiner and Percy Scott, *Day by Day We Magnify Thee* (12s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: Charles Williams, *The Descent of the Dove* (15s.). [This book, when first published, was reviewed in THEOLOGY, January, 1940, p. 77.]

GLEERUP (LUND): Ragnar Askmark, *Ämbetet i den Svenska Kyrkan* (Kr. 12.50).

GUANDA (ROME): Angelo Crespi, *Dall'io a Dio* (n.p.).

HAMMOND, HAMMOND AND CO.: *Man's Creativeness?* (Journal of the Present Question Conference) (2s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: *Our Heritage of Free Prayer* (9d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: *Some Basic Texts* (6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: John Calvin, *Instruction in Faith* (1537) (7s. 6d.).

MOWBRAYS: W. H. Longridge, S.S.J.E., *The Spiritual Exercises of Saint Ignatius of Loyola* (16s.).

OVERDALE COLLEGE (SELLY OAK, BIRMINGHAM): H. H. Rowley, *The Authority of the Bible* (1s. 3d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Hanns Lilje, *The Valley of the Shadow* (7s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: M. Riquet, S.J., *The Christian Faces the Ruins* (7s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: Maurice B. Reckitt, *G. K. Chesterton: A Christian Prophet for England To-day* (1s. 6d.); D. S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Twenty Answers* (1s. 3d.); Yngve Brilioth, *Landmarks in the History of Preaching* (2s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher